

GBPress- Gregorian Biblical Press

AN EIGHTEENTH CENTURY BISHOP: JOHN CARROLL OF BALTIMORE

Author(s): JAMES HENNESEY

Source: *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae*, Vol. 16 (1978), pp. 171-204

Published by: [GBPress- Gregorian Biblical Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23563998>

Accessed: 25/05/2014 07:18

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



GBPress- Gregorian Biblical Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

JAMES HENNESEY S. I.

AN EIGHTEENTH CENTURY BISHOP:
JOHN CARROLL OF BALTIMORE

Summarium. — Ioannes Carroll (1735-1815), prius iesuita, tum primus episcopus (1789) atque archiepiscopus (1808) Baltimorensis in Statibus Foederatis Americae Septentrionalis, describitur tum Sedi Apostolicae et Romano Pontifici deditissimus, tum quoque ecclesiae nationalis iuribus suis gaudentis propugnator ardentissimus. Inter talia iura imprimis facultatem episcopos eligendi et Romano Pontifici ad approbandum proponendi sustinuit. Interventum tamen gubernii civilis in rebus ecclesiasticis reiecit. Populo vero, ut particeps fieret, in initiis caute favit; postea similem participationem plerumque timuit. De necessitate communionis cum Sede Apostolica instans, primatum inibi invenit. Magisterium infallibile collegii episcoporum una cum Pontifice Romano sentientis hocque consentiente defendit.

A Gentleman of Learning and Abilities

John Adams, later George Washington's Vice-President and then his successor as second President of the United States of America, once remarked with undisguised relief that in his hometown of Braintree, Massachusetts, Roman Catholics were « as rare as a comet or an earthquake »¹. Intolerance of « papists » came easily to one born and bred, as Adams was, in Puritan New England. Yet, on February 18, 1776, writing to James Warren, the same John Adams perfectly characterized John Carroll (1735-1815), later first Archbishop of Baltimore and Father of the Catholic hierarchy in the United States, as « a Roman Catholic priest and a Jesuit, a Gentleman of learning and Abilities »². Carroll ceased to be a Jesuit with the suppression of the Society of Jesus in 1773; he never ceased to think of himself as a son of Ignatius Loyola. His learning and abilities made their mark on the infant church which emerged in the United States during the Revolutionary era. So did his understanding and Anglo-American style of Catholicism.

John Carroll was the fourth of seven children of Daniel Carroll (1696-1751), an Irish immigrant into the colony of Maryland, and of

¹ JOHN ADAMS, *Works*, 10 vols., Boston 1856: IX, 355.

² JOHN ADAMS, SAMUEL ADAMS and JAMES WARREN, *Warren-Adams Letters*, 2 vols., Boston 1917: I, 207.

Eleanor Darnall (c. 1703-1796), daughter of an old Maryland English family closely associated with the Lords Proprietor, the Baltimores. Educated in 1746-8 at Father Thomas Poulton's school on the Jesuit estate of Bohemia Manor in northeastern Maryland, young Carroll was then enrolled at the English Jesuit college at St. Omer in French Flanders where he remained until he entered the English Jesuit novitiate at nearby Watten in 1753. His cousin, schoolmate and lifelong friend, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, reported of him in 1750: « I believe Cousin Jack Carroll will make a good scholar, for he is often first »³. John Carroll's destination in life seems to have been to remain, as did other Maryland-born Jesuits, as a teacher in the Flanders colleges. After a usual course of philosophical and theological studies at Liege he was ordained and then made his solemn profession as a Jesuit in 1771. Shortly thereafter he made the « grand tour » of Europe as tutor to the eighteen-year old heir of the English Lord Stourton. By the fall of 1773 he was Prefect of the Marian Sodality at Bruges, but soon after went to England as chaplain to Lord Arundell. In the spring of 1774 he sailed home to America, where he carried on a pastoral ministry from his mother's home at Rock Creek, Maryland, until his appointment by Pope Pius VI in 1784 as Ecclesiastical Superior of the Mission in the thirteen United States of North America. He was named first Bishop of Baltimore in 1789 and Archbishop in 1808. In 1776 he had, at the request of the Continental Congress, accompanied an official mission to Canada in the vain hope of attracting the *habitants* to the rebel cause. The three commissioners with whom he travelled, Benjamin Franklin, Samuel Chase, and his own cousin, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, all became, shortly after their return from Canada, signers of the Declaration of Independence. John Carroll's older brother, Daniel, was likewise an active patriot, and in 1787 a signer of the Federal Constitution. The future bishop was, as John Adams suggested, a gentleman of learning and abilities, who moved easily in American society. He was also, as will be seen, well versed in theology and Christian tradition and, as a perceptive observer of the era in which he lived, extraordinarily capable of fitting the one to the other.

The Jesuit, 1753-1773

John Carroll's Jesuit experience was a significant formative factor in his life. Few documents from this twenty-year period survive, but his partial account of travels in the early 1770s with the Hon. Charles Philip Stourton is informative⁴. They were in Rome in the

³ ELLEN HART SMITH, *Charles Carroll of Carrollton*, New York 1971, 31.

⁴ THOMAS O'BRIEN HANLEY, ed., *The John Carroll Papers*, 3 vols., Notre Dame/London 1976: I, 6-25. Subsequent references to this collection will be by volume

winter of 1773 and Carroll was ever after haunted by memories of the events of that year which saw the destruction of the religious order to which he belonged. He had kept a close incognito and avoided Jesuit houses, although he did make discreet contacts with English Jesuits in the city. Four letters dated between October, 1772, and June, 1773, and written to Thomas Ellerker, Jesuit contemporary and theology professor at Liege, detailed intrigues leading up to the suppression of the Society in the summer of 1773⁵. A dozen years later, memories had not dimmed as Carroll challenged Franciscan controversialist Arthur O'Leary for his « servile » defense of Pope Clement XIV and declared:

...certainly I saw repeated instances of conduct, which upon the coolest & most unprejudiced consideration appear irreconcilable not only with benevolence, but even with common humanity, & the plainest principles of justice.

In a draft he had added: « I had almost said, with the clearest dictates of Religion »⁶.

When in 1790 his most frequent correspondent in England and fellow ex-Jesuit, Charles Plowden, was gaining prominence as a literary defender of the papacy, the newly consecrated Bishop of Baltimore wrote and warned him:

...you have been used of late to see so much unjust suspicion entertained against the popes, that your zeal to defend the just prerogatives of the holy See makes you justify expressions, which certainly were introduced for the sake of usurpations on the rights of the civil power, or of the Diocesan clergy. Remember the iniquities and oppressions of popes such as Ganganelli, & you will be careful to obey & respect their orders, within the line of their rightful jurisdiction, but not to extend it farther, which sooner or later always does harm⁷.

Five years before this last letter, Carroll had urged Plowden to « disabuse the world of prejudices in his [Clement XIV's] favour, which were first inculcated by the indefatigable industry of an inveterate faction », but at the same had urged him, « when you treat of that pope's character, to give no way to your imagination; but support all your assertions with such authority, as shall convict the

and pages only. Standard studies of Carroll are JOHN CARROLL BRENT, *Biographical Sketch of the Most Reverend John Carroll*, Baltimore 1843; PETER GUILDAY, *The Life and Times of John Carroll, Archbishop of Baltimore, 1735-1815*, New York 1922; ANNABELLE M. MELVILLE, *John Carroll of Baltimore, Father of the American Hierarchy*, New York 1955; JOHN GILMARY SHEA, *The Life and Times of the Most Reverend John Carroll, Bishop and First Archbishop of Baltimore*, New York 1888.

⁵ I, 26-31.

⁶ Carroll to O'Leary, Baltimore: I, 224-5. The editor estimates that this undated letter was probably sent in 1787.

⁷ Carroll to Plowden, London, October 4, 1790: I, 475. Charles Plowden (1743-1821) was Father Minister of the Great College at Bruges in 1773. He was later Master of Novices (1803) and Provincial and Rector of Stonyhurst (1817-1821) in the English Jesuit Province.

most hardened prejudices »⁸. Despite this somewhat tainted plea for historical objectivity, Carroll was as subject to his own prejudices as the next man. But in the matter of papal authority, he always clearly distinguished his difficulties with concrete functional aspects of the papacy from the « just prerogatives » and the « rightful jurisdiction » of the Holy See.

Pope Clement XIV and the Brief *Dominus ac Redemptor* of July 21, 1773, were not Carroll's only functional problems with the Roman Curia of his day. He shared with many eighteenth-century Jesuits the conviction that the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith had played a role in the downfall of the Jesuits, and he was convinced that the influence of the Congregation in America was to be resisted at all costs. His arguments were both theological and political. They were also emotional, colored by memories of 1773. Theologically Carroll argued that the American Catholic community formed a « church » and not a « mission », and that only the latter was a proper object of Propaganda's interest. Politically he argued that the Congregation had the image of a foreign political operation (« ... a Congregation existing in his [the Pope's] States ») and that as such its interference was unacceptable in the emerging United States. These were not basic positions from which he retreated, but much of the earlier emotion did drain away and even as he sailed over the Atlantic to his episcopal ordination in the summer of 1790 he was able to write to the Prefect of Propaganda, Cardinal Lorenzo Antonelli, of his gratitude for « the expectations and good opinion » entertained of him by the Congregation and of its « benevolence » towards him.

The Thirteen United States of North America

General hostility to Roman Catholics was the legacy in English America of two centuries of bitter anti-papist feeling both in the mother country and in its colonies. It lingered through the Revolution and was a factor with which Carroll must cope. The United States also manifested symptoms which would become more and more familiar as increasing numbers of nations emerged from colonial situations. There was considerable determination to create a future that would have as little reference as possible to the Old World of Europe. John Carroll shared the American sense of newness, but combined it with a profound realization of the importance of the historical dimension to an integral understanding of Christianity. His thinking was congenial with that of his friend Benjamin Franklin, of whom he wrote in 1785: « The Doctor wishes his country to be

⁸ Carroll to Plowden, Rock Creek, June 29, 1785: I, 192.

unconnected with Europe in every other way, than that of a communication of all useful knowledge »⁹. Carroll added the idea of the Pope as head of the church and of the see of Rome as the center of ecclesiastical unity. He was conscious of his own role as a bishop in the worldwide body of bishops. But he distinguished these spiritual connections from anything remotely savoring of a political connotation. He understood, because he shared them, republican ideas prevalent in America. In 1782 he wrote playfully to his royalist British friend Charles Plowden that he was happy that the Emperor Joseph II loved both justice and innovation, « since it is so new a thing for crowned heads to be just, or rather for those who govern under them ». He had, he admitted, « contracted the language of a republican »¹⁰.

Carroll's task was to work out the accommodation between American republicanism and monarchical forms inherited from the church's past. In pursuit of that goal his own genuine acceptance of concepts basic to the American religious experience helped: religious pluralism in a state religiously neutral, freedom of conscience and of the exercise of religion for all, a sensitivity towards and toleration of religious divergence. Not that there were no problems. Increasing age and coping with local problems challenged Carroll's openness to democratic forms in the church. Early sympathy with his friends of England's Catholic Committee eroded. He was appalled by the French Revolution and by what he saw as a type of ecclesiastical populism emerging in the former German ecclesiastical states of the Rhineland. Joseph II's brand of regalism and its Italian version in Tuscany had never appealed to him and he proved an attentive reader of Pius VI's constitution of August 28, 1794, *Auctorem Fidei*, with its enumeration of the errors of the 1786 Synod of Pistoia. Reprobation in church matters of « furious democracy » began to creep into his correspondence. But withal there was something precious in the American experience that he tried to the end to retain as he worked to evolve an ecclesiological framework that would suit the contrasting demands of the political and the religious communities to which he belonged.

Organization of the Clergy, 1782-1784

Carroll had not been happy with his homecoming in 1774 to a church which rapidly became in practice autocephalous, severed from now non-existent Jesuit superiors in England and Rome, and soon after from the admittedly always loose surveillance of the Vicar-

⁹ Carroll to Plowden, Rock Creek, February 27, 1785: I, 169.

¹⁰ Carroll to Plowden, Maryland, February 20, 1782: I, 65.

Apostolic of the London District. He served « a very large congregation », often riding twenty-five or thirty miles to attend the sick. Once a month he made a round trip of over one hundred miles to offer mass at another congregation in Virginia. The rest of the clergy — ex-Jesuits all until the Revolution — were supported by revenue from the extensive farms which they had inherited from the Society, but Carroll received no stipend because he had refused to accept the right of the last Jesuit Superior, Father John Lewis, to transfer him from place to place. The situation disturbed him, as he wrote to Plowden in 1782:

The Clergymen here continue to live in the old form: it is the effect of habit, and if they could promise themselves immortality it would be well enough. But I regret, that indolence prevents any form of administration being adopted which might tend to secure to posterity a succession of Catholic Clergymen, and secure to these a comfortable subsistence.

In Carroll's view, the « ignorance, indolence and delusion » of the ex-Jesuits combined with John Lewis's « irresolution » to prevent serious attention to the substantive problems facing the tiny Catholic community¹¹. He took the matter in hand himself and in 1782 circulated the draft of a plan for organizing the clergy¹². It had been nine years since the suppression of the Society of Jesus had severed one set of religious ties for the Maryland and Pennsylvania missionaries and six years since the Declaration of Independence had effectively, if not canonically, severed the Americans' last link with the Vicar-Apostolic of the London District.

The Constitution of the Clergy drawn up in three meetings of priests at Whitemarsh plantation in Maryland during 1783 and 1784 reflected the political climate of the times¹³. It included both financial arrangements and a rule of life for the clergy. Control of the clergy's assets was sharply separated from « spiritual power derived from the Bishop ». The latter was left with Lewis, who had become Vicar-General to Bishop Richard Challoner of the London District when his office as Jesuit Mission Superior was extinguished by the 1773 suppression. Under the Whitemarsh plan the estates were held in common under the superintendence of a Chapter of Deputies (two from each of three Districts into which the mission stations and their priests were divided) which met at least triennially and which elected as its agent a Procurator-General. Writing to the Luxembourg ex-Jesuit Bernard Diderick, who took exception to decisions made by the Chapter, Carroll insisted that it had « the supreme legislative authority in matters of internal government » of the clergy¹⁴.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 66.

¹² I, 59-63.

¹³ I, 71-77.

¹⁴ Carroll to Diderick, Baltimore, July 25, 1788: I, 322.

While the spiritual Superior had no control over the clergy's property, the latter retained considerable indirect power in the spiritual area. The Superior made pastoral appointments and gave faculties, but no priest could be supported from the revenues of a District unless he had been accepted for service there by the District's Deputies. Nor was a priest to be « imposed on any District without their consent, expressed by their members of Chapter ». Vacancies were filled by the Deputies, « application having been first made to the Superior *in spiritualibus* ». It was up to the Chapter, or to the Procurator-General, to withdraw financial support from a priest stripped of his faculties by the Superior. The Whitemarsh Constitution did more than protect the ex-Jesuit property from outside interference. It introduced at the very origins of the American Catholic church a strongly democratic clerical form of church government.

Republican Ideas and Foreign Jurisdictions

The Whitemarsh Constitution enabled the clergy to get on with their business, but it was only a beginning. The precarious situation of the little band of Catholics — they numbered less than 1% of the national population — in a hostile environment played a part in shaping their attitudes, just as did the fact that they had generally supported the Revolution and after its end were as enthusiastic as any of their compatriots about the new democratic climate of the country. These thoughts, along with his anti-Propaganda bias, were in Carroll's mind as he wrote to Plowden on September 26, 1783. The Englishman had relayed reports from the Anglo-American ex-Jesuits' agent at Rome, Father John Thorpe, about the Congregation's interest in the clergy's American real estate. Carroll commented:

Your information of the intention of the Propaganda gives me concern no farther, than to hear that men, whose institution was for the service of Religion, should bend their thoughts so much more to the grasping of power, and the commanding of wealth. For they may be assured, that they will never get possession of a sixpence of our property here; & if any of our friends could be weak enough to deliver any real estate into their hands, or attempt to subject it to their authority, our civil government would be called upon to wrest it again out of their dominion. A foreign temporal jurisdiction will never be tolerated here; & even the Spiritual supremacy of the Pope is the only reason why in some of the United States, the full participation of all civil rights is not granted to the R.C. They may therefore send their Agents when they please; they will certainly return empty handed....¹⁵

The problem of foreign jurisdiction — and the consequent charge of divided loyalty — had plagued English-speaking Catholics since the Reformation and early became a staple ingredient in American

¹⁵ I, 78.

colonial anti-Catholicism. Carroll did his best to confront it. Writing on July 10, 1784 to praise English controversialist Joseph Berington for his *State and Behaviour of the English Catholics*, he asked him to take up two subjects: the use of Latin in the church's liturgy and « the Extent and Boundaries of the Spiritual Jurisdiction of the Holy See »¹⁶. The latter question soon came to a head in a practical way. Trilateral negotiations during 1783 and 1784 involving the Apostolic Nuncio at Versailles, France's Foreign Minister and the American Minister Plenipotentiary, Dr. Franklin, but ignoring the American clergy, resulted in Carroll's appointment (June 9, 1784) as « Superior of the Mission in the thirteen United States of North America ». The appointment was processed through Propaganda¹⁷. Carroll was angry at the process, briefly considered refusing the preferred office, and wrote Plowden: « Little do they know the jealousy entertained here of foreign jurisdictions »¹⁸. He repeated the theme in a November 26, 1784, letter to the Nuncio at Versailles, Prince Giuseppe Doria-Pamphili, warning him that the notion was unacceptable that « our faith demands a subjection to His Holiness incompatible with the independence of a sovereign state »¹⁹. Three months later the same caution was relayed to Roman agent John Thorpe. Even though, he said, he knew that his ideas would « sound ungrateful at Rome », he had to express them for the sake of « the permanent interests of religion »²⁰.

In an official letter as Superior to Cardinal Lorenzo Antonelli, Prefect of Propaganda, dated February 27, 1785, Carroll explained that the situation in the new republic was delicate, that all foreign jurisdiction was hateful, that American Episcopalians had severed their ties to the Bishop of London and were selecting their own bishops, and that arrangements must be made for eventual choice of a Catholic ecclesiastical superior which would take into account both « the Independence of our country » and « the spiritual juris-

¹⁶ Carroll to Joseph Berington, Maryland, near George-town, Potowmack River, July 10, 1784: I, 148.

¹⁷ Leonardo Cardinal Antonelli to Carroll, Rome, June 9, 1784, in DONALD C. SHEARER, ed., *Pontificia Americana. A Documentary History of the Catholic Church in the United States, 1784-1884*, Washington 1933, 58-9. Standard for this period is JULES A. BAISSNÉE, *France and the Establishment of the American Hierarchy. The Myth of French Interference*, Baltimore 1934. See also C. R. FISH, *Documents Relative to the Adjustment of the Roman Catholic Organization in the United States to the Constitutions of National Independence: American Historical Review* 15 (1910) 800-829; and EDWARD I. DEVITT, *Propaganda Documents, Appointment of the First Bishop of Baltimore: Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia* 21 (1910) 185-236.

¹⁸ Carroll to Plowden, Rock Creek, September 18, 1784: I, 141.

¹⁹ Carroll to Doria Pamphili, n.p., November 26, 1784: I, 153 (English text); 154 (French text).

²⁰ Carroll to Thorpe, Maryland, near George-town, February 17, 1785: I, 163. Thorpe (1726-1792) was Roman agent for English and American ex-Jesuits, and himself a former member of the English Jesuit Province.

diction of the Holy See ». Lest Antonelli take the hint lightly, he added that prominent laymen, and in particular the Catholic members of the Continental Congress and of the state legislatures of Pennsylvania and Maryland, wanted to memorialize the Pope directly and had been dissuaded only because he had convinced them that his present letter was a more appropriate avenue of approach. Finally, Carroll told the Cardinal, there was the matter of the sixth Article of Confederation, which could possibly be understood to apply to ecclesiastical as well as civil offices ²¹.

A New People, a New World

John Carroll was gifted with a remarkable historical consciousness. He knew he lived and was called to exercise authority in a time and place that were new and different. To Plowden on February 27, 1785, he wrote that there had to be from Rome « some appearance of an inclination to leave us that Ecclesiastical liberty, which the temper of the age and of our people requires, as well as the lasting benefit of Religion » ²². Six years later he had not changed his mind. He sensed that a new and far more extensive world was in the making, one which would be no longer merely a colonial appendage of Europe. He had been discussing a possible division of his diocese of Baltimore, then threw the question into a larger context:

Our distance, tho not so great, if geometrically measured, as S. America, Goa and China, yet in a political light is much greater. S. America, & the Portugese possessions in Africa & Asia have, thro' their metropolitical countries, an intermediate connexion with Rome; and the missionaries in China are almost all Europeans. But we have no European metropolis, and our Clergy

²¹ Carroll to Antonelli, Maryland, February 27, 1785: I, 169-174 (English text); 175-179 (Latin text). The Articles of Confederation agreed to in the Continental Congress on November 15, 1777 and ratified by Maryland, the last state to do so, on March 1, 1781, were the fundamental law of the United States until 1788. The pertinent section of Article VI read: « ... nor shall any person holding any office of profit or trust under the united states, or any of them, accept of any present, emolument, office or title of any kind whatever from any king, prince or foreign state ... » More to Carroll's point would have been to cite Article XLII of the New York state constitution of 1777, which required that those wishing to become citizens of that state « abjure and renounce all allegiance and subjection to all and every foreign King, Prince, Potentate and State, in matters ecclesiastical as well as civil ». A similar oath in New York, demanded of all office-holders, barred Catholics from public office there from 1788-1806. (JOHN WEBB PRATT, *Religion, Politics and Diversity. The Church-State Theme in New York History*, Ithaca 1967, 95, 107, 123-125). In colonial times the Maryland laity, headed by Charles Carroll II (« of Annapolis ») had protested both to the English Jesuit Provincial and to the Vicar Apostolic of the London District against appointment of a vicar apostolic in America. Their argument was that such a move would break the law and provide a pretext for persecution. (THOMAS HUGHES, *History of the Society of Jesus in North America, Colonial and Federal*, 4 vols., New York 1907-1917: Text, II, 591-592).

²² Carroll to Plowden, Rock Creek, February 27, 1785: I, 168.

will soon be neither Europeans, nor have European connexions. There will be the danger of a propensity to a schismatical separation from the centre of unity.

Having faced the problem, he was sanguine of the outcome: « But the Founder of the Church sees all these things, and can provide the remedy. After doing what we can we must commit the rest to his providence »²³. These were the terms within which Carroll understood his responsibilities and attempted to define the status of a national church within the Catholic communion. He worried constantly over the inevitable foreign cast which the tie to Rome involved, but « the Pope's Spiritual supremacy » and the See of St. Peter as « the centre of ecclesiastical unity » remained constants in his theological world. At the same time he was keenly attuned to the republican new world in which he lived and determined that the Catholic church in the United States be structured in ways that compromised neither attachment to its Roman ecclesiastical center nor its American political context.

« Mission » and « Church »

Basic to Carroll's approach was a theological understanding of the church which included a clear distinction between two forms of organization of the ecclesial community, the « mission » and the properly organized national « church ». Soon after he had received word of his appointment as Mission Superior, he wrote a letter in late 1784 to the veteran ex-Jesuit from Württemberg and pastor at Philadelphia, Ferdinand Farmer. The faculties he had received were « much too confined for the exigencies of this country », he reported. But what was worse, they were granted by Propaganda, Rome's missionary arm, and this he found inappropriate. The faculties were given « during their pleasure *only* »; no priests were to work in America but such as came with the Congregation's approval, and, when eventually a bishop was named, he would be a vicar-apostolic. To all this Carroll was opposed. He summed it up when he wrote: « They consider us *missioners*; and our labours as employed in *mission* »²⁴. That was not the way Carroll understood matters. A key to his approach can be found in notes he took on his readings in Alexander Natalis, *Selecta Historiae Ecclesiae Capita*, on the way bishops were chosen in the fourth and fifth centuries. One note reads: « The Roman Pontiff will provide with respect to Bishops for nations re-

²³ Carroll to Plowden, Baltimore, October 12, 1791: I, 524.

²⁴ Carroll to Farmer, n.p., n.d.: I, 155-158. Farmer (1720-1786) came to America c. 1751 and ministered in New York and New Jersey as well as at Philadelphia. In 1768 he was elected to the American Philosophical Society and in 1779 became a trustee of the University of Pennsylvania.

cently converted to the Faith²⁵. Carroll's distinction of « church » and « mission » is rooted here. The United States was not a « nation recently converted ». It was a country in which the Roman Catholic community was established and recognized as sharing equal rights and privileges with other Christians. Its Catholic community constituted a proper « church ». In Carroll's mind certain organizational facts followed from this: a national church needed bishops, and basic choice of persons for episcopal office should be made in the country itself, not in Rome; a « church » must have its own priests and a home seminary in which to educate them. Carroll argued his way through each of these questions.

Vicars Apostolic and Ordinary Bishops

Carroll's late 1784 letter to Farmer expanded on the theme of « church » versus « mission ». It was a theme familiar to anyone brought up as he was in the tradition of English Catholicism, where the question of having a « bishop in ordinary » or a « vicar apostolic » as presiding prelate had long been controverted. Underlying the question of the presiding prelate was the more basic question: was England (and now America) a missionary country or one where the church was to be considered as normally established? John Carroll had no doubts. He rejected the idea of a vicar apostolic for the United States (« a refined Roman political contrivance », he called the office) and gave as his reason what he foresaw as the prospective incumbent's « utter dependance, both for his station and for his conduct, on a foreign jurisdiction ». Carroll went further. Episcopal appointment in the United States should not come from the Pope (« for that would create more jealousy in our government, than even in France, Germany, or Spain »), nor from American civil authorities or legislatures (« which being composed of discordant Religionists [non-Catholics], would be very improper for the business »). The bishop should be chosen by the clergy, as had already been done by American Episcopalians when they had to effect a separation from procedures used in the Church of England²⁶.

Carroll used a twofold argument: the church must avoid the appearance of being « foreign », and it had the right to a degree of autonomy. He took up the first point in a February, 1785, letter to his Roman agent, John Thorpe, telling him bluntly that it would never be tolerated in the United States that the Catholic ecclesiastical superior, whatever his title, « receive his appointment from a foreign

²⁵ II, 76. Alexander Natalis, *Selecta Historiae Ecclesiasticae Capita*, 24 vols., 1676-1686, was a favorite source book for Carroll.

²⁶ Carroll to Plowden, Maryland, April 10, 1784: HUGHES, *Documents* I, II, 602-603; Carroll to Farmer, *loc. cit.* above n. 24, p. 157.

state, and only hold it at the discretion of a foreign tribunal or congregation ». Such a situation would ultimately lead to an attack on Catholics' civil rights. « For these reasons », he continued:

...every thinking man among us is convinced, that we must neither request or admit any other foreign interference than such, as being essential to our religion, is implied in the acknowledgement of the Bishop of Rome being, by divine appointment, head of the universal Church; and the See of S. Peter being the centre of ecclesiastical unity²⁷.

But Carroll's argument was not merely the negative one of avoiding a foreign tinge in American Catholicism. He was sincerely convinced that the local church had the right to a degree of autonomy, while at the same time it preserved its links with the Pope as head and Rome as the focal point of ecclesial unity. He was disappointed, he wrote to Joseph Berington, in the English hierarchy:

Long before I left Europe, I used to be astonished, that the English Bishops did not exert themselves to obtain a more independent Appointment and Jurisdiction. And I am more persuaded now, since the rigour of the penal laws is somewhat abated²⁸.

In 1789, after the American petition for a bishop in ordinary had been granted, Carroll returned to the theme of rightful autonomy in a letter to Charles Plowden:

I do not know, on what principles your respectable V.V.A.A. govern themselves, by opposing the appointment of Ordinaries for England. I think, it would remove many plausible objections against the Catholic Religion, give a more decided authority to the Prelates, & introduce an Ecclesiastical government more consonant to other churches & the established discipline²⁹.

By the time the American priests made a formal petition to Pope Pius VI for establishment of a diocese in the United States, practical problems were multiplying which provided further ammunition. They now argued that episcopal rank and ordinary authority were necessary for the man who was to preside over what was becoming a fractious church. The official letter of petition, signed by Carroll and Fathers John Ashton and Robert Molyneux, was dated from Baltimore, March 12, 1788³⁰. They informed the Pontiff that the Superior, « a simple priest who has only delegated authority », had been accused by rebels in the New York City congregation of St. Peter's of wielding an authority that was « illegal, because it was set up by a foreign tribunal and was dependent on this tribunal

²⁷ Carroll to Thorpe, Maryland, near George-town, February 17, 1785: I, 162-163.

²⁸ Carroll to Berington, Rock Creek, September 29, 1786: I, 218-219.

²⁹ Carroll to Plowden, Baltimore, March 20, 1789: I, 351.

³⁰ I, 279-280 (English text); 280-282 (Latin text). Robert Molyneux (1738-1808), an Englishman, was later first Superior of the restored Society of Jesus in the United States and President of Georgetown College. John Ashton (1742-1815), Irish ex-Jesuit, was Procurator-General of the Clergy.

both as regards its exercise and its duration ». The « same would hold for a bishop who enjoys vicarious and not ordinary powers ». Similar arguments were made to Cardinal Antonelli in a letter dated March 18/April 19, 1788. Carroll emphasized that in deciding on procedures to be followed with respect to the United States, Propaganda must:

seriously weigh the spirit and the prejudices which prevail in these States, and ... so arrange the naming of a bishop, and give him such authority that, while union and due obedience to the Apostolic See is maintained, in so far as possible, he be freed from the suspicion of any kind of subjection which is not absolutely necessary³¹.

A Regular Clergy

Carroll had strong views on the necessary autonomy of a national church once it had been established, and on the role which a bishop played in the church. He also held strong views on the makeup, education and function of the clergy who staffed such a church, the « regular clergy », as he referred to them. The term in his correspondence does not have its normal canonical reference to clergy belonging to a religious order, but designates those in the regular service of the diocese. No national church, Carroll was convinced, could claim the title unless it had its own clergy and had made provision for their continuation. Writing to Plowden on September 18, 1784, he touched on the subject when he criticized Propaganda:

To govern the spiritual concerns of this country, as a mission, is absurd, seeing there is a regular Clergy belonging to it; & with God's assistance there will be in time, a succession of ministry to supply their places as they drop off³².

Several months later, in his letter to Farmer about the new prelacy, he amplified his ideas:

We form not a fluctuating body of labourers in Christ's vineyard, sent hither and removeable at the will of a Superior; but a permanent body of national Clergy, with sufficient powers to form our own system of internal government, &, I think, to chuse our own Superior, & a very just claim to have all necessary Spiritual authority communicated to him, on his being presented as regularly and canonically chosen by us³³.

An essential element in the national church was that it provide its own clergy.

³¹ Carroll to Antonelli: I, 285-286 (English text); 290 (Latin text).

³² Carroll to Plowden, Rock Creek, September 18, 1784: I, 151.

³³ Carroll to Farmer, n.p., n.d.: I, 156-157.

A Seminary for Young Clergymen

Carroll's years as Superior, and later as Bishop, were plagued by a procession of clerical adventurers, « a medley of clerical characters », he called them, wandering priests whose European bishops or religious superiors had been only too happy to release them for service in America. They promised little for the future of the church in the United States. Carroll had shared with Farmer his hope that each year one or two Catholic young men educated in secular colleges in Pennsylvania and Maryland (Farmer was a trustee of the University of Pennsylvania; Carroll of St. John's and Washington Colleges in Maryland) would take up a religious vocation. He initially saw it as a simple process. After the youths had completed their college education,

...the business will be to form them to the virtues necessary for their state, and give them a Theological institution: and here will appear the necessity of a Seminary for young Clergymen to the raising of which all our savings, all the contributions of our friends must be directed. In such a seminary, which may be contiguous to one of our own houses, we need have only one elderly Gentleman unfit for hard labour, but of approved virtue, & conduct, to train the young men to the duties of their State, and one other, a man of learning & abilities to teach them Divinity³⁴.

In later years a primary purpose in the founding of the academy at Georgetown was « the education of youth & perpetuity of the body of Clergy in this country », as the Chapter wrote sharply to the « Gentlemen of the Southern District », the conservative ex-Jesuits in the parishes of southern Maryland who were reluctant to spend money on either bishops or schools³⁵. Carroll put it succinctly for Charles Plowden: « ...our great view, in the establishment of an academy, is to form subjects capable of becoming useful members of the ministry »³⁶.

There was another dimension to Carroll's thought on clerical education, one which highlights his concern for a truly national aspect in the local church. He was wary of suggestions that American clergymen be trained abroad. Cardinal Antonelli had proposed that two seminarians be despatched from the United States to Propaganda's Urban College in Rome. To Thorpe Carroll wrote on February 17, 1785:

With respect to sending two youths, I shall inform Propaganda that it would surely be very acceptable to us to have children educated gratis in so religious a seminary; and very acceptable to us all to have a succession of

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 158.

³⁵ J. DIGGES *et al.* to the Gentlemen of the Southern District, n.p., n.d., estimated by the editor to have been distributed in January, 1787; Carroll was a signer: I, 226.

³⁶ Carroll to Plowden, Rock Creek, January 22, 1787/Baltimore, February 28, 1787: I, 241.

ministers of the altar thus provided for: but, as I suppose they will not receive any into their College, but such as shall afterwards be subject to their government; and it being yet uncertain what effect my representations may produce I shall delay that measure till farther information³⁷.

In a subsequent letter to Antonelli Carroll mentioned that arrangements for the students must await finalization of governmental arrangements in the American church. He then obliquely brought up the question of the « Propaganda Oath », warning that the boys' parents must be informed « whether some promise, and of what nature, would be demanded of their sons before they return to their country ». For, Carroll concluded, « all possible care must be taken lest the Catholics, both clergy and laity, should seem to depend on some foreign power in matters of such great moment »³⁸.

Rome was not the only venue for seminary training about which Carroll had hesitations. When an offer came of places at Mainz, he sent his thanks, but claimed that the church in America could not assume the cost of sending candidates to the archiepiscopal seminary³⁹. To Cardinal Antonelli, he gave as his reasons for this reluctance, that he would send no seminarians to Germany until he knew more about the theology being taught there. He was suspicious of views on the authority of the laity which he understood were taught in German universities and thought it better that his seminarians not be exposed to them⁴⁰. Eventually Carroll did send a pair of students to Rome, but his principal provision for « a succession of regular clergy » was made by securing the services of French Sulpicians, who opened St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, in 1791.

³⁷ Carroll to Thorpe, Maryland, near George-town, February 17, 1785: I, 164.

³⁸ Carroll to Antonelli, Maryland, February 27, 1785: I, 173 (English text); 178 (Latin text).

³⁹ Carroll to John Hock, Baltimore, September 15, 1788: I, 329 (English text); 331 (Latin text). According to Carroll Hock was « Ecclesiastical Counsellor at Mainz, Pastor of B.V.M. Collegiate Church, canon and scholar at St. Maurice's. » (*Ibid.*, p. 330, n. 1). Carroll later (II, 242) described him as « an officious ecclesiastic » and reported in 1798 that he « is now, or at least was lately at New York, having been obliged to fly his country privately ». He complained that Hock (as he now spelled the name) had not made his presence known and that he had heard of him being in the United States only by accident. (Carroll to a Pennsylvania Lawyer, George Town, August 24, 1798: II, 243-244).

⁴⁰ Carroll to Antonelli, July, 1790, on the high seas: I, 448 (English text); 450 (Latin text). Carroll wrote this letter en route to Europe for his episcopal consecration. He completed it in London, July 30, 1790. Carroll had serious problems in Philadelphia with German laity who asserted a *jus patronatus* and he was dissatisfied with many of the German priests who came to America. For the atmosphere in the Cisirhenane region at the time, see R. R. PALMER, *The World of the French Revolution*, New York 1972, 238 ff.

Lorenzo Ricci Redivivus?

A standard charge against Carroll was that in organizing the clergy he favored his ex-Jesuit brethren. It was made by the Meath diocesan priest Patrick Smyth in a pamphlet, *The Present State of the Catholic Missions Conducted by the Ex-Jesuits in North America* (Dublin 1788) and by the French priest Claude de la Potterie, in *The Resurrection of Laurent Ricci: or, a True and Exact History of the Jesuits* (Philadelphia 1789), dedicated to « the new Laurent Ricci in America, the Rev. Fr. John Carroll ». Both authors had been among Carroll's « medley of clerical characters », the Irishman serving at Frederick, Maryland, and the Frenchman in Boston, and both were intemperate in the criticisms they levelled at him. At the same time, it was true that the Superior did seek a measure of homogeneity among his clergy and this led him to turn instinctively, when he could, to those who had been trained as he was. He made every effort to attract home to their native land those American ex-Jesuits who had remained abroad after the suppression of 1773, and he was likewise hospitable to others who had been members of the Society of Jesus. When, in 1788, dissidents among the German parishioners in Philadelphia asked for one of the Capuchin Heilbron brothers as their pastor in place of the former Jesuit novice from Bavaria, Lorenz Graessl, Carroll refused and told Plowden that he had made no secret of his reason, « viz.: that as long as there was an Exjesuit alive, willing and capable of serving a Congregation, which had been raised by that body of men, he should have preference »⁴¹. He had enlisted Plowden in his program to recruit ex-Jesuits, writing him on June 29, 1785: « I have written in a pressing manner to all, whom I conceive likely to come to our assistance ... Encourage all you can meet with, Europeans or Americans, to come amongst us ... »⁴². But he was also a realist, as he confided a year later:

I shall be under the necessity of calling in other assistants besides those who were raised in the Society or under its former members. To preserve peace, & uniformity, I wish'd to avoid this in Maryland and Pennsylvania, and perhaps Virginia. A wider field I knew we could not embrace: but if larger supplies do not arrive soon, the great and prevailing consideration of charity will oblige me to admit labourers, wherever they come from, if their faith and morals are sound. I am well aware of the inconveniencies and mortification, which must result from this measure⁴³.

⁴¹ Carroll to Plowden, Maryland, March 1, 1788: I, 274. Graessl (1753-1793), a contemporary of Johann Michael Sailer in the novitiate of the Bavarian Jesuit Province, arrived in Philadelphia in 1787 and was nominated in 1793 by Carroll to be Coadjutor Bishop, but died soon after in a yellow fever epidemic.

⁴² Carroll to Plowden, Rock Creek, June 29, 1785: I, 192.

⁴³ Carroll to Plowden, Rock Creek, July 11, 1786: I, 213.

To the Gentlemen of the Southern District, opposed as they were to anything that smacked of change, went the warning from Carroll and the members of the Chapter:

We could not rationally carry our views so far as to form to ourselves the idea of a Society to be established in this Country sufficiently adequate to its extent; nor can we put such a clog on people's dispositions, as to leave no door for admittance to H. Orders, but thro' that of the Novitiate. Religious orders in the church are only auxiliaries to the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy established by Christ, and we may hope that as Providence has provided for us, so it will provide for those, whom it calls in another way.

Later in the same letter, the argument is summarized with the question: « Was the Society instituted for the good of souls, or must souls be sacrificed for the good of the Society? »⁴⁴. The national church and its needs were paramount. John Carroll accepted religious and secular priests from a variety of backgrounds, and in that way, whatever his personal preferences, secured a succession of regular clergy.

Selection of Bishops

John Carroll's thought on the nature and structure of a national church can perhaps best be traced in the evolution of his ideas on the selection of bishops. His approach was clearly non-Erastian, but he was not averse to co-operation with civil government. He sought a formula which would maintain both the rights of the Holy See and the autonomy of the local church. Government interference was never a problem. Rome was understandably somewhat more reluctant about some of his suggestions. Interference in American affairs of European episcopal colleagues, especially among the Irish bishops, complicated matters to a considerable degree.

Church and State

Carroll opposed participation by civil government in the choice of bishops, but was not himself loath to use the influence of secular officials. When in 1788 the question of naming a bishop came to a head, he sought and obtained the intervention of the Spanish Minister at New York, Don Diego de Gardoqui and, through Gardoqui's good offices, those of an unlikely ally for an ex-Jesuit, the Conde de Floridablanca, chief minister of Charles III and the diplomat who in 1773 had orchestrated the final campaign of the Bourbon courts against the Jesuits. Carroll was pleased with what he termed Gardoqui's « thorough penetration into the nature & necessary ef-

⁴⁴ I, 228, 230.

fects of our Republican governments ». He was even more pleased that the Minister had agreed that one of those necessary effects was that the church in the United States should be governed by a bishop chosen by the American clergy and then « approved by the Holy See for the preservation of unity in faith »⁴⁵.

Five years earlier, Carroll had been less happy over the Paris negotiations prior to his appointment as Superior, since they had been carried on without reference to the American clergy. In this he had shown himself rather more « American » in his indignation at the intermingling of church and state than had the American Minister, Benjamin Franklin, whose diary suggests that he enjoyed his brief interlude as ecclesiastical counselor. Carroll was annoyed that « the Court of Rome » dealt with Franklin without « ever deigning to apply for information to the Catholick Clergy in this country ». He briefly considered writing to Franklin « about the impropriety of Propaganda intermeddling here », and regretted that his contacts in the Continental Congress were limited, since his brother Daniel's term had just expired and the only other Catholic member, Thomas Fitzsimons of Philadelphia, had resigned. Otherwise he would have seen to it that Congress make an even stronger reply than it had made to the Roman request for its views on the choice of a bishop⁴⁶.

Twenty years later, when there was question of a vicar, and then a bishop, for the newly-acquired Louisiana Territory, Bishop Carroll did not hesitate to consult, in person and by letter, Secretary of State James Madison and to list among the qualities required in a candidate that his « attachment to the U. States was unequivocal »⁴⁷.

⁴⁵ Carroll to Diego de Gardoqui, n.p., April 19, 1788: I, 297, 298.

⁴⁶ Carroll to Plowden, Rock Creek, September 18, 1788: I, 151, 152. Franklin made an almost casual note of the appointment in his private journal for July 1, 1784: « The Pope's Nuncio called, and acquainted me that the Pope had, on my recommendation, appointed Mr. John Carroll, Superior of the Catholic Clergy in America, with many of the Powers of a Bishop ». The Nuncio had also told him that Carroll would probably soon be made a titular bishop and asked advice on a venue for the episcopal ordination. Franklin recommended Quebec as convenient and assured the Nuncio that the fact of its being in an English province was no problem, so long as ordination by the local bishop would give him no authority over the ordinand. « He said, not in the least; that when our Bishop was once ordained, he would be independent of the others, and even of the Pope; which I did not clearly understand ». (ALBERT HENRY SMYTH, ed., *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin*, 10 vols., New York 1905-1907: I, 349).

⁴⁷ Carroll to James Madison, Baltimore, November 17, 1806: II, 534-535. Madison (1751-1836), known in American history as an advocate of strictly interpreted separation of church and state, answered in two letters, both dated November 20. In the first he explained the « scrupulous policy of the Constitution in guarding against a political interference with religious affairs », and left matters to Carroll, saying that he and President Thomas Jefferson were sure that an ecclesiastic would be chosen who was possessed of « a due attachment to the independence, the Constitution and the prosperity of the United States ». The second, more personal, letter, expressed Madison's hope that Carroll would be placed permanently in charge of the Louisiana church. (JOHN TRACY ELLIS, ed., *Documents of American Catholic History*, [2 vols., Chicago 1967]: I, 187-188).

In the same connection he assured his own nephew, Daniel Brent, a clerk in the State Department, that

if any clergyman acting there [in New Orleans] under my authority should ever betray dispositions, or countenance measures unfriendly to the Sovereignty of the United States; or if he should ever hold correspondence of a suspicious nature with a foreign nation, he shall be deprived of any commission from me and of the care of souls⁴⁸.

Carroll was committed to the anti-Erastian consequences of the religiously plural society emerging in the United States. At the same time he actively sought ways in which church and state could find their way in co-existence and co-operation.

Rome and the Choice of Bishops

In the spring of 1790 the fiery Irish ex-Jesuit Procurator-General of the clergy's estates, John Ashton, angrily attacked provisions of the Bull *Ex Hac Apostolicae* (November 6, 1789), by which the Diocese of Baltimore had been established. He objected to indications in the Bull that future bishops of the see would be chosen in Rome and that the ordinary seemed to be given control of « all ecclesiastical incomes », which was contrary to the by-laws of the Corporation of the Roman Catholic Clergymen. In reply Carroll explained his own position: he opposed « the popes having the nomination of the Bishop », because of « the certainty I have, that the exercise of such power by the pope would draw on our Religion a heavy imputation from the government under which we live ». Having said that, John Carroll entered on a long process, never satisfactorily resolved, of trying to determine a method of choosing bishops for the American church in a way that would be acceptable both to Rome and to Americans.

In his letter to Ashton, the bishop argued further that in the future it would not be possible to have all the clergy share in the election of a bishop, as had been done in his own case. It was for that practical reason, he thought, that the Bull had not specified a process. He understood full well the position taken in the document:

The pope, according to the pretensions, which the see of Rome has always supported, says, he will nominate hereafter.

But that did not close the question:

But I conceive that the Clergy will have as good right to say, that the election shall be held by members of their own body, & that they never can, with safety, or will admit any Bishop who is not so constituted.

« The time for holding this language », he continued, will be in a

⁴⁸ Carroll to Daniel Brent, Baltimore, March 3, 1807: III, 11-12.

Diocesan Synod of all the Clergy, & not at a meeting of Chapter only ». In a final paragraph, the Bishop-elect provided another interesting hermeneutical insight. Addressing himself to Ashton's concern about assignment of temporal administration to the new Ordinary, he commented:

As to the investing of the Bishop with the administration &c., I never conceived it as anything more than the expression of those claims which Rome has always kept up, tho universally disregarded; viz; that the pope is the universal administrator, some have even said, *Dominus* of all ecclesiastical property.

« Rome cannot give », he assured the worried Procurator, « what it has never possessed, administration of our estates; and I presume that a Bishop, who should attempt anything under such an authority, would be resisted, and deservedly, as the pope would have been, had he attempted it since the dissolution »⁴⁹.

Practical Implementation

Carroll continued to think on ways in which a procedure could be shaped. He considered alternatives. In the spring of 1788 he had written to William O'Brien, O.P., at New York, that « the officiating Clergymen in America » would be the episcopal electors⁵⁰, but to Plowden he wrote that he hoped election would « never be vested in the whole body of officiating clergy; but only certain select persons &c. »⁵¹. This last idea was spelled out in a proposal made by participants in the Diocesan Synod held at Baltimore on November 7 and 8, 1791. They recommended that the ten priests who had worked longest in America, together with another five chosen by the Bishop, serve as episcopal electors. The Holy See would retain the « right to reject candidates until someone is chosen who meets the full approval of the Pope »⁵². Carroll explained to Plowden that the last provision was made because of his « sollicitude to provide for a close & intimate union with the Holy See »⁵³.

The electoral committee envisioned in 1791 was never created, although Carroll did not give up the idea. In 1793 he nominated Lorenz Graessl to be his Coadjutor with right of succession, informing Cardinal Antonelli that he did so after having sought « the counsel of the older and more worthy workers in this vineyard of the Lord ». In the same letter he asked authorization « to organize ten or twelve priests who are in charge of the principal congregations

⁴⁹ Carroll to John Ashton, Baltimore, April 18, 1790: I, 435-437.

⁵⁰ Carroll to William O'Brien, Baltimore, May 10, 1788: I, 309.

⁵¹ Carroll to Plowden, Baltimore, November 12, 1788: I, 332.

⁵² Carroll to Antonelli, April 23, 1792: I, 32-33 (English text); 38-39 (Latin text).

⁵³ Carroll to Plowden, Baltimore, April 30, 1792: II, 39.

in this diocese into a sort of chapter, an advisory body for the bishop ». The dignity would inhere in the major congregations and pass to the successors of these quasi-capitulars. They would elect their own dean and be responsible for spiritual direction of the diocese during an episcopal vacancy. They would substitute for the cathedral chapter more usual in organized dioceses, but impossible in Baltimore since it was impractical to have so many priests live in one place⁵⁴.

Events in Europe effectively severed communications between Carroll and Rome. Graessl died of yellow fever before action could be taken on his nomination, and the Bishop reported that he was once again consulting the more prudent and experienced priests⁵⁵. Finally he proposed another ex-Jesuit, Leonard Neale, pastor at Philadelphia and onetime missionary in Demerara⁵⁶. It was to be five years before the bulls arrived and he could be consecrated Bishop of Gortyna and Coadjutor to Carroll.

An American Hierarchy

The international situation was not the only difficulty troubling the sixty-five year old Carroll as he faced the new century. He knew that the episcopal base in the United States had to be broadened to provide adequate care for a growing Catholic community, but a series of challenges to his authority by priests and congregations in several cities had made him cautious. Even before the 1791 Synod he had shared with Plowden his fears about division of the diocese. He wanted first, he said, to be sure that

an uniform discipline may be established in all parts of this great continent; and every measure so firmly concerted, that as little danger as possible, may remain of a disunion with the Holy See⁵⁷.

This concern for Catholic unity nudged him away from positions as bold as the one he had taken with John Ashton in 1790. Writing to the Secretary of the Propaganda, Stefano Borgia, on February 14, 1804, he told the prelate that he had rejected requests that he take

⁵⁴ Carroll to Antonelli, n.p., June 17, 1793: II, 95 (English text); 98 (Latin text).

⁵⁵ Carroll to Antonelli, July 3, 1794: II, 117 (English text); 118 (Latin text). Graessl died in the fall of 1793. The apostolic brief appointing him Bishop of Samosata was dated January 14, 1794.

⁵⁶ Carroll to Antonelli, Philadelphia, October 15, 1794: II, 129-130 (English text); 130-131 (Latin text). Neale, one of three brothers active in the ministry at the time, was born in 1747, had entered the Jesuit order in 1767, spent the years 1780-1783 as a missionary in present-day Guyana, returned to Maryland in April, 1783, served as pastor in Philadelphia and was President of Georgetown College, 1799-1806. Consecrated as Coadjutor in 1800, he succeeded Carroll as second Archbishop of Baltimore, 1815-1817.

⁵⁷ Carroll to Plowden, Baltimore, October 12, 1791: I, 524.

a hand in church affairs in the newly-acquired American Louisiana Territory. He had told petitioners:

that I had no authority over them, that their episcopal see established by the Apostolic See still functioned, that if it was now vacant no doubt a successor would be named by the Holy Father, and that the person chosen and confirmed would shortly receive notification⁵⁸.

Carroll's correspondence about division of the Diocese of Baltimore was equally mild. In June, 1807, he recommended candidates for dioceses to be erected at Boston, Philadelphia and Bardstown. He suggested that a fourth new diocese, at New York, be temporarily entrusted to the Bishop of Boston, and that he himself be Administrator of the Diocese of Louisiana and the Two Floridas⁵⁹. There is no available evidence on what, if any, consultative process he used in selecting episcopal candidates. His nominees were named to Boston, Philadelphia and Bardstown, but Rev. Charles Nerinckx was appointed Administrator for Louisiana (he declined) and an Irish Dominican resident in Rome, Richard Luke Concanen, was designated for New York and consecrated by Cardinal di Pietro five months before the new Metropolitan at Baltimore learned that he was an Archbishop with four suffragan sees. His initial reaction to introduction of the « Irish Connection » was calm. He thanked Archbishop John Troy, O.P., of Dublin, who had been the first to tell him of the diocesan realignment, explained matter-of-factly to Plowden that « His Holiness wished to provide at once for all the places & nominated Fr. Concanen »⁶⁰, and wrote to another English ex-Jesuit that he « always had a favourable account » of the new bishop⁶¹.

Concanen in the event never arrived in America. Bishops Michael Egan, O.S.F., Jean Lefebvre de Cheverus and Benedict-Joseph Flaget, S.S., were ordained to the episcopacy at Baltimore in October, 1810, and then met with Carroll and Neale to discuss urgent problems confronting the church. The fourth in a series of resolutions which they adopted reads:

Nomination of Bishops. In case the Holy See will graciously permit the nomination to vacant Bishopricks to be made in the United States, it is humbly & respectfully suggested to the Supreme Pastor of the Church to

⁵⁸ Carroll to Stefano Borgia, Baltimore, February 14, 1804: II, 435 (English text); 437 (Latin text).

⁵⁹ Carroll to Michele Cardinal di Pietro, June 17, 1807: III, 27-28.

⁶⁰ Carroll to Troy, Washington, September 28, 1808: III, 69-70; *id.* to Plowden, Baltimore, December 5, 1808: III, 72. John Troy, O.P., had been Prior of San Clemente in Rome and was Archbishop of Dublin 1789-1823.

⁶¹ Carroll to Strickland, Baltimore, December 8, 1808: III, 74-75. William Strickland (1731-1819) became President of the English Academy at Liege in 1783 and was later Procurator of the English Jesuit Province.

allow the nomination for the vacant Dioceses to proceed solely from the Archbishop & Bishops of this Ecclesiastical Province⁶².

Opposition was building to foreign intervention such as that which had resulted in Bishop Concanen's appointment to New York.

The next crisis arose with the death on July 22, 1814 of Bishop Egan of Philadelphia. Archbishop Carroll circularized the surviving suffragans, together with Anthony Kohlmann, S.J., Administrator of New York, and Louis DeBarth, Administrator of Philadelphia. He wanted their advice so that they could pick the « one, two or three persons, best esteemed by us & send on their names, character &c. to Rome, with our respective nominations ». He also asked their permission to consult in the matter « the most discreet and experienced » clergy of the deceased bishop's diocese. All this Carroll did although, as he told the bishops, no answer had ever come to their 1810 petition and so « nothing can be done *authoritatively* in this matter »⁶³.

All the names produced by this system were those of priests active in the American ministry, Carroll wrote Bishop Neale⁶⁴, and they were forwarded to Cardinal Lorenzo Litta at Propaganda on November 28, 1814⁶⁵. But not everyone was happy. From Kentucky Bishop Flaget of Bardstown protested the nomination of John Baptist David, S.S., for Philadelphia, and claimed he had not been consulted. Carroll reminded him that he had been asked, had refused to vote and had opposed nomination of more bishops until a greater supply of priests was available⁶⁶. The system had its domestic kinks.

The Irish Connection

Carroll had taken Concanen's appointment in stride. Increased Irish activity in American church affairs was another matter. In his letter to Litta the Archbishop noted that no nomination was included of a bishop for New York since it was the understanding of the American bishops that the Pope had already chosen the French Sulpician Ambrose Maréchal for the post⁶⁷. Maréchal was known and respected in the United States, and there was no opposition to his selection, although there had been no initiative for it from

⁶² The Resolutions are dated November 15, 1810: II, 132.

⁶³ Carroll to the Bishops *et al.*, Baltimore, August 23, 1814: III, 291-292.

⁶⁴ Carroll to Neale, Baltimore, September 27, 1814: III, 295-296.

⁶⁵ Carroll to Lorenzo Cardinal Litta, Baltimore, November 28, 1814/January 5, 1815: III, 303-304 (English text); 306 (Latin text). The English text confuses New York (which is in the Latin) with New Orleans.

⁶⁶ Carroll to Flaget, Baltimore, August 12, 1815: III, 353-354.

⁶⁷ *Loc. cit.* above n. 65, p. 303. Maréchal (1768-1828) eventually became Coadjutor Archbishop in 1817, but succeeded to the see before his consecration in December of that year.

the United States. But in fact another Irish Dominican, John Connolly, had been named to the vacant diocese and consecrated at Rome on November 6, 1814. The news reached Carroll in a letter from Archbishop Troy sometime in the early part of 1815. His reply was relatively calm, but news about still a third Irish Dominican *episcopabilis* did disturb him. This was William Vincent Harold, who had been a priest in Philadelphia from 1808-1813 and was now being mentioned as Egan's successor. Carroll tartly inquired of Troy: « Would it not be resented as a very improper interference if we the Bishops in the U.S. should presume to suggest to the Holy See the persons to be appointed to fill the Vacant Sees of Ireland? »⁶⁸.

By June, 1815, the Archbishop's temper had risen considerably. Writing to Plowden he included Connolly's nomination to New York among his grievances. No one in America knew or had been consulted about him. He worried that « this may not become a very dangerous precedent, fruitful of mischief by drawing censure on our religion, & false opinion of the servility of our principles ». As for Harold, he now knew that Troy was one of his recommenders, along with his Coadjutor, Daniel Murray, and the French Archbishop of Bordeaux. They were, he complained, interfering « in an affair so foreign to their concern, and to which they are so incompetent ». He asked Plowden to inform the English Bishop John Milner of the situation, if the latter were still at Rome⁶⁹.

Archbishop Carroll learned in mid-summer, 1815, that letters sent to Rome as long since as 1810 had never been received by Propaganda. He hastened to update Cardinal Litta on the American bishops' recommendations for Philadelphia, and their opposition to Harold. He was not, however, inclined to do battle over New York, accepting Connolly's appointment as a *fait accompli*⁷⁰. He had in fact come to the end of his course, dying in Baltimore on December 3, 1815, just shy of his eighty-first birthday. To the end he resisted foreign influence in the selection of American bishops, but he never managed to get in place a workable system for local selection, and the letters of his later years suggest an almost routine acceptance of Roman appointments not easily reconciled with theories which he had espoused earlier.

⁶⁸ Carroll to Troy, n.p., n.d.: III, 312.

⁶⁹ Carroll to Plowden, n.p., June 25/July 24, 1815: III, 338-340. Milner and Murray had both gone to Rome as agents for the Irish bishops in an effort to secure withdrawal of the February 16, 1814 rescript signed by the Secretary of Propaganda, Monsignor Quarantotti, which favored Grattan's emancipation proposal of 1813.

⁷⁰ Carroll to Litta, Baltimore, July 17, 1815: III, 344 (English text); 346 (Latin text).

John Carroll and the Holy See

John Carroll's ideas and practice in the matter of selecting bishops reveal a great deal about his concept of the status of a national church. But the Pope and the Holy See both played a central and integral role in his understanding of Catholicism. Writing to Leonard Neale, who had finally become his Coadjutor eight months previously and who served as regional bishop in the southern part of the diocese, he recommended that he subscribe to a new London Catholic magazine where he would find

...an excellent encyclical letter of the present pope to all Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops &c. Instead of a sermon to day, I read the first part of it to this congregation and will continue it next Sunday; and advise you to recommend the same to your Br [Francis Neale, pastor in Georgetown], and the pastors of other Congregations subordinate to your immediate inspection. For tho the letter is only addressed to the prelates of the Church, yet it contains many points useful to all⁷¹.

Carroll had his problems with individual popes and their decisions, most strikingly in the case of Clement XIV. In his early years he had his suspicions of « congregations existing in the pope's states », particularly Propaganda. Even his recommendation to Neale of the encyclical *Diu Satis* (May 15, 1800) has about it a note of reserved detachment. Nevertheless for John Carroll the pope's role as head of the church and of the See of Rome as center of ecclesiastical unity were paramount. The Church, and the papal position in it, were of divine origin. Other elements had to be seen in that context.

In a letter to the Sulpician Antoine Garnier, who had left the United States for France in 1803, Carroll expressed his apprehensions about the council of the Church in France convoked at Notre Dame in Paris on June 16 of that year by the Emperor Napoleon:

There is great reason to fear, that the time is approaching & perhaps is actually come, when intrigues, terror, promises, and all means of persuasion have induced the Bishops, uncanonically assembled, to adopt decrees tending to the fatal effect so dreaded & condemned by S. Cyprian, of constituting a church on a human, instead of a divine foundation: *Humanam faciunt ecclesiam*⁷².

John Carroll wanted no « human church ». He had always been clear on that. The earliest flicker of his later large-scale disenchantment with the English priest and controversialist Joseph Berington occurred in 1786 when he re-read Berington's *State and Behaviour of English Catholics* and faulted him for seeming

⁷¹ Carroll to Neale, Baltimore, July 5, 1801: II, 353. Neale's younger brother, Francis (1756-1837) was pastor of Holy Trinity Church, Georgetown.

⁷² Carroll to Garnier, Baltimore, November 24, 1811: III, 161.

to import that [the Pope] has no prerogative which has not been surrendered to him by the Community. Is this quite accurate? is he not *jure divino* Head of the Community?⁷³.

In another contemporary letter, this time to Franciscan Arthur O'Leary, he had returned to the theme, suggesting that Berington's seeming failure to ascribe to « the Successor of St. Peter » a supremacy *jure divino* must be due to « a slip of the pen (for I cannot think it any thing else) »⁷⁴.

Carroll's thought was clearly enunciated in two letters which he wrote to the former Constitutional bishop, Henri Grégoire. Thanking Grégoire on September 9, 1809 for the gift of his *Legitimité du serment civique*, he told him straight out that « I do not approve some of the principles avowed in the pamphlets and proceedings of what is called the *constitutional clergy* », and then proceeded to explain his basic understanding of Catholic polity:

...it must be evident to every sincere believer in the religion of Jesus Christ, from a view of late and present events, that it will be best preserved in its unity and integrity, by the intimate union and correspondence between its visible head, and the bishops and pastors diffused over the Christian world.

But at the same time he balanced that statement carefully. The letter continues:

...I shall contribute the little support, within my power, to inspire veneration for the independent power of the H[oly] See, and the episcopacy; confining however that jurisdiction within the limits of the divine bestower of it, and beyond which it ought never to have been extended; I mean things purely spiritual^{74a}.

For John Carroll, pope and bishops belonged together; their power was something that belonged in the spiritual realm, and there only.

Two years later, Grégoire sent the archbishop a copy of his work on religious sects, and expressed the hope that it would help in efforts toward Christian unity. Carroll on June 4, 1811, wrote his doubts that such a purpose would be achieved by denying or rendering « wholly uncertain » the existence of any center of Catholic unity. He had no doubt that such a center did exist, and where it was to be found:

...in the steadfast, public, avowed doctrine, confession and authority of the

⁷³ Carroll to Berington, Rock Creek, September 29, 1786: I, 218. An initial enthusiasm for Berington (1743-1817) waned quickly, and Carroll was soon writing of him as shallow and impatient, sarcastic and impious, « unwitty and very irreligious ».

⁷⁴ Carroll to O'Leary, Baltimore, n.d., estimated by editor as 1787: I, 225.

^{74a} Carroll to Grégoire, n.p., September 9, 1809: III, 105. Henri Grégoire (1750-1831) had become Constitutional Bishop of Blois in 1791. He remained a staunch opponent of Roman polity and of the concordatory settlement of church affairs in France. Carroll in an earlier letter (III, 18) refers to him as « abbé Grégoire », but writes to him always as « My Lord ».

Successor of S. Peter, united in language and belief with all (I mean morally all) the Bishops of the Catholic world^{74b}.

Challenges to his own episcopal authority were occasions which Carroll used to effect in spelling out his concept of the pope's role in the church. In 1789, for example, he emphasized to the refractory Capuchin friar John Heilbron that resistance to the bishop was resistance to « the authority established by the H. See »⁷⁵. The same message went to the friar's supporters in Philadelphia's Holy Trinity German congregation⁷⁶. Eight years later, when the same group was again in turmoil over the claims of two more recently arrived German clergymen, John Goetz and William Elling, Carroll reminded the parishioners that « the Holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church » was « the Mother and Mistress of all Churches », that « true obedience » had been promised to, and was owed to, « the Bishop of Rome, Successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ », and that the « spiritual supremacy of Christ's Vicar » was

an essential tenet of our religion ... the bond of our union, which cements and keeps together, in the profession of the same faith, in the celebration of the same solemn and public worship, and under one uniform government, established by Jesus Christ, and perpetuated by succeeding pastors, so many different nations, so distant from each other, and unconnected in every other respect⁷⁷.

Unity of faith, Carroll was convinced, could not endure « apart from the authority of the Holy See ». He dedicated his episcopacy, he told Cardinal Antonelli, to laying

the most solid and enduring foundation not merely of union with the Holy See but also of conformity, obedience and love. For daily experience teaches me that faith and morals are kept intact if there is a close union with Christ's vicar on earth, and that nearly every lapse in either originates in a diminution of respect for the See of Peter⁷⁸.

These preoccupations remained constant, and in Carroll's mind were not in any way incompatible with his strong advocacy of and concern for the integrity and dignity of individual national churches.

Infallibility

Intimately involved with Carroll's attitude to the Holy See was his theological understanding of the place and extent of infallibility

^{74b} Carroll to Grégoire, n.p., June 4, 1811: III, 149-150. Two volumes of Grégoire's *Histoire des sectes religieuses* appeared in 1810.

⁷⁵ Carroll to Heilbron, Baltimore, October 13, 1789: I, 388.

⁷⁶ Carroll to Holy Trinity Congregation, Baltimore, December 2, 1789: I, 396.

⁷⁷ Carroll to the Congregation of Trinity Church, February 22, 1797: II, 201-203.

⁷⁸ Carroll to Antonelli, on the high seas, July, 1790: I, 447 (English text); 450 (Latin text).

in the church. His major theological effort was *An Address to the Roman Catholics of the United States of America* (1784), a reply to the pamphlet published by his kinsman and fellow ex-Jesuit Charles Wharton, *Letter to the Roman Catholics of Worcester*, in which Wharton explained why he had left the Roman and joined the Anglican communion. Carroll argued strongly for the church's claim to be endowed with infallibility, and then proceeded to a further point:

He says, that 'all Roman catholics are bound to admit an infallible authority; yet few of them agree, where or in whom it resides'.

For Carroll the matter was not in doubt:

...in the doctrine which we teach, as belonging to faith in this point, and as an article of communion, there is no variation; and with all his reading and recollection, I will venture to assert, that he cannot cite one catholic divine, who denies infallibility to reside in the body of bishops united and agreeing with their head, the bishop of Rome.

Wharton, he continued, was wrong in suggesting that three specifications of the *locus* of infallibility — in the pope, in a general council, or « in the pope and council received by the whole church » — were all simply opinions of theologians, « for the last is not a mere opinion of schoolmen, but the constant belief of all catholics; a belief in which there is no variation ». He added:

Some divines indeed hold the pope, as Christ's vicar on earth, to be infallible, even without a council; but with this opinion faith has no concern, every one being at liberty to adopt or reject it, as the reasons for or against may affect him⁷⁹.

The Object of Infallibility

Carroll never retreated from the position he took on papal infallibility in the *Address*. That doctrine was a respectable theological opinion, no more. But there was another question in which he became involved during his visit to England for episcopal ordination in 1790. He arrived to find English Catholics debating the oath fashioned by the Catholic Committee to accompany what eventually became the Catholic Relief Act of 1791. A provision in the oath required explicit denial of the pope's infallibility. Carroll's host, Thomas Weld of Lulworth Castle, his friends Lords Arundell and Clifford, and the ex-Jesuits and their former pupils generally, were ultramontane defenders of the papal prerogative. Charles Plowden, his own faithful correspondent, had just published *Considerations*

⁷⁹ The *Address* is reprinted: I, 82-144. The section on the *locus* of infallibility is on pp. 104-105. Wharton (1748-1833) had a prominent subsequent career as an Episcopalian clergyman in the United States. He had been before his return in 1784 chaplain to the Roman Catholic community in Worcester, England.

on the Modern Question of the Fallibility of the Holy See in the Decision of Dogmatical Questions⁸⁰. But the American Bishop-elect also had friends in the Catholic Committee. He met several times and dined at least once with the Committee's Secretary, Charles Butler⁸¹. Lord Petre he encouraged in his efforts at Catholic emancipation, and he predicted that the American example in religious toleration would influence English practice⁸². There was an awkward moment when Lord Arundell asked his advice on the oath. Carroll referred him to his spiritual advisors, but admitted to Archbishop Troy that

...the oath in its present form appears to me to be inadmissible; that it implies a renunciation of the pastoral powers of the successor of St. Peter; and that its obvious meaning is different from that which the advocates for the oath fix to it⁸³.

Carroll tried to keep a prudent silence, but did inquire of Plowden why an answer could not be given to the vexing question of the scope claimed for the pope's infallibility. Did it apply to « all orders he issues, or facts, which he asserts », or was it applicable only in doctrinal matters? Confusion on the answer to this question was making the internecine debate among Catholics even more difficult than it would in any case have been. Ex-Jesuit Joseph Reeve, chaplain at Ugbrooke Park to Lord Clifford of Chudleigh, had argued with Carroll that the infallibility disclaimed in the oath was only « infallibility as to facts »⁸⁴. But Charles Butler had told Carroll that it made no difference. Non-Catholic Englishmen thought even an infallibility restricted to doctrine « a pernicious tenet, & dangerous to civil government »⁸⁵.

No further theological precision emerged from Carroll's inquiries, but his experiences during the summer and fall of 1790 in England pointed up some of the conflicts which tore at him as he struggled to elaborate an ecclesiology suited to the era in which he lived.

⁸⁰ Carroll received episcopal orders August 15, 1790, in the chapel on the grounds of the estate, Lulworth Castle, of Thomas Weld, Sr. (1760-1810), father of the later Cardinal Thomas Weld, brother-in-law of George IV's wife, Mrs. Fitzherbert, and one of England's greatest landowners. Carroll had been chaplain in 1773-4 to Henry, 8th Lord Arundell of Wardour (d. 1808), and considered that position « the very best place in England. » (Carroll to Plowden, Maryland, February 28, 1779: I, 53). Charles, 7th Lord Clifford of Chudleigh (1750-1832) was Arundell's son-in-law.

⁸¹ Carroll to Plowden, London, September 2 and September 7, 1790: I, 454, 459. Butler (1750-1832) was the moving spirit of the Catholic Committee and the Cisalpine Club.

⁸² Carroll to Petre, London, August 31, 1790: I, 452-453; *id.* to Plowden, London, September 7, 1790: I, 459.

⁸³ Carroll to Arundell, London, October 4, 1790: I, 474; *id.* to Troy, London, October 3, 1790: I, 472.

⁸⁴ Carroll to Plowden, White-Marsh, February 3, 1791: I, 491. Reeve (1733-1820), Carroll's senior by a year at the Watten novitiate, wrote *A View of the Oath Tendered by the Legislature to the Roman Catholics of England*, London 1790.

⁸⁵ *Id.* to *id.*, London, September 2, 1790: I, 454.

Emotionally he was more in tune with Plowden and friends than he was with the Committee. But his American experience of life in a land where religious toleration was the norm, if not always the practice, influenced him strongly in the opposite direction. The problems of contemporary English Catholics served him as a laboratory in which to study and clarify his ideas. So, for example, he was put off by extremism like that of the erratic Scottish protege of Lord Petre, Alexander Geddes, whom he dismissed as a « designing and unsound teacher »⁸⁶. He was sympathetic with the desire for greater local voice in selection of bishops, but when it was connected, as in England, with « swallowing down such an oath », he defected to the conservatives⁸⁷. Years later, summing up his thoughts on Charles Butler, he recorded his respect for that lawyer's talents, « but his desire to effect the entire destruction of penal and restrictive laws carries him sometimes much too far in his compliance with the views of government »⁸⁸. The pope's infallibility was for John Carroll a freely debatable position. The scope of infallibility was something on which he was not clear. But government interference in church matters was unacceptable.

Bishop of an Ordinary National Church

A national church, as John Carroll understood it, was distinguished from a mission by its note of permanence. Writing to Ferdinand Farmer in 1784 he argued that one key factor in that permanence was civil recognition that « our Religion has acquired equal rights & privileges with that of other Christians »⁸⁹. Characteristics of a national church included communion with the Bishop and Church of Rome and recognition of a primacy there which was central to the structure of Catholicism. Ultimate teaching authority, however, and the charism of infallibility, resided « in the body of bishops united and agreeing with their head, the bishop of Rome »⁹⁰. The bishops dispersed throughout the world had a clear function: « The body of bishops everywhere claim a divine right, in virtue of their ordination, to interpret the decrees of councils and the ordinances of popes »⁹¹. Within the national church, bishops should

⁸⁶ Carroll to Plowden, White-Marsh, February 3, 1791: I, 491. Geddes (1737-1802) was a protege of Lord Petre, who subsidized his biblical researches. He called himself « a Protestant Catholic, but no papist », and denied the pope any « jurisdictional power » beyond the confines of the Papal State, leaving him only a primacy of rank, precedence and « superinspection ». For a recent view, see BERNARD ASPINWALL, *The Last Laugh of a Humane Faith: Dr. Alexander Geddes, 1737-1801*: New Blackfriars 58 (July, 1977) 333-340.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸⁸ Carroll to Plowden, Baltimore, March 20, 1815: III, 330.

⁸⁹ Carroll to Farmer, n.p., n.d., estimated by editor as December, 1784: I, 156.

⁹⁰ Carroll, *Address to Roman Catholics*: I, 105.

be locally chosen and then approved by the Pope, there should be a clergy belonging to the church and an educational system to provide for its continuance. Carroll wrote also on other aspects of local church polity, and in particular on the topics of parish governance and of liturgy.

The first case in which Carroll had to address the question of lay involvement in church governance occurred in New York City where a distinguished group of laymen had on June 10, 1785 incorporated themselves and begun construction of a church building in Barclay Street. Carroll, as newly appointed Superior, laid the cornerstone of the church on November 5. But the trustees were soon embroiled in a battle over which of two Irish Capuchins should be their pastor. The Superior addressed the laymen on January 24, 1786, in a letter which firmly asserted his own rights. He refused to accept that the congregation had

a right not only to chuse such parish priest, as is agreeable to them; but of discharging him at pleasure; & that after such election, the Bishop, or other Ecclesiastical Superior cannot hinder him from exercising the usual functions.

If ever such principles should become predominant, he continued,

the unity and Catholicity of our Church would be at an end; & it would be formed into distinct & independent Societies, nearly in the same manner, as the Congregational Presbyterians of your neighboring New England States.

He also pointed out that technically there could be no question of appointing or dismissing a pastor, since no regular hierarchy had yet been set up in the United States, but then made a significant statement which reflected his own thinking on the lay role in church governance:

Whenever parishes are established, no doubt, a proper regard, and such as is suitable to our Governments, will be had to the rights of the Congregation in the mode of election and presentation: and even now I shall ever pay to their wishes every deference consistent with the general welfare of Religion ...⁹².

It did not quite work out that way. Carroll was acutely sensitive to the spirit, in England as well as in America, of « indocility and independance on all authority », and he soon thought it « fatal » to allow congregational nomination of pastors⁹³. In 1805 his thought had achieved a lapidary quality as he informed James Kernan, Secretary of the Board of Trustees of the congregation at Charleston:

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, I, 106.

⁹² Carroll to Dominick Lynch and Thomas Stoughton, Rock-Creek, January 24, 1786: I, 203-206. Lynch (1754-1825) and Stoughton (1748-1826) were brothers-in-law, partners in the importing business, and trustees of St. Peter's Church in New York City. Stoughton also served as Spanish consul at New York.

⁹³ Carroll to Plowden, Rock-Creek, May 26, 1788: I, 311.

« The laity are neither the source of spiritual jurisdiction, nor can stop its course »⁹⁴. Nine years later he took for his own English Bishop John Milner's denunciation of « ecclesiastical democracy », and informed the trustees at St. Mary's, Philadelphia, that « an overbearing influence of the people, in the appointment of the Pastors », would never be accepted. Catholics, he reminded them, were not Presbyterians⁹⁵.

Carroll's advocacy, as early as 1784, of a vernacular liturgy is well known. On July 10 of that year, in a letter to Joseph Berington, he paired use of Latin in the liturgy with papal power as the two greatest obstacles to reunion of Christian churches, and he thought Latin a barrier to the wider diffusion of Catholicism in North America. He could not help thinking, he wrote, « that the Alteration of this Discipline ought not only to be solicited, but *insisted upon*, as essential to the Service of God & Benefit of Mankind ». He was concerned that, « either for want of Books, or disability to read, the greatest part of our Congregations must be utterly ignorant of the meaning and Sense of the publick Offices of the Church ». He understood that it might once have been necessary to resist the « insulting and reproachful Demands of the first Reformers », for change, but that era was gone and he could attribute present inaction only to « chimerical fears of Innovation, or to Indolence and Inattention in the first Pastors of the national churches, in not joining to solicit, or indeed *ordain* this necessary alteration »⁹⁶.

Berington injected Carroll's ideas into the struggle in which he was then engaged with Bishop John Douglass of the London District, which brought down on the American's head a storm of protest. But on September 29, 1786 Carroll wrote to him again: he discussed the need for governmental autonomy and then continued:

I remain equally persuaded of the Expediency of using the vulgar Tongue in the public Offices of Religion. But hitherto I am able to do no more than express my Wishes, and inforce on my Brethren my own Sentiments.

« Most of them », he added, « feel the Necessity of such a Change in this Country equally with myself »⁹⁷.

By the following year the Superior was having second thoughts, as he wrote to Franciscan Arthur O'Leary that « Mr. Berington's brilliant imagination attributes to me projects, which far exceed my powers, and in which I should find no cooperation from my Clerical Brethren in America, were I rash enough to attempt their introduc-

⁹⁴ Carroll to Kernan, n.p., August 15, 1805: II, 485.

⁹⁵ Carroll to Trustees of St. Mary's Church, Baltimore, August 16, 1814: III, 290.

⁹⁶ Carroll to Berington, Maryland, near Georgetown, Potowmack River, July 10, 1784: I, 148-149.

⁹⁷ *Id.* to *id.*, Rock-Creek, September 29, 1786: I, 219.

tion, upon my own authority »⁹⁸. His alarm had become all the greater, he wrote Plowden in June, 1787, when he heard from P. J. Coghlan, the English Catholic bookseller, that his name was being bandied about not only in connection with Berington's crusade for a vernacular liturgy, but also, at least in a guilt by association, with agitation for abolition of clerical celibacy⁹⁹. To Coghlan himself he wrote acknowledging his advocacy of the vernacular, but on the expressed condition that such a change was authorized by « the Holy See & first Pastors of the Church ». It was not for an individual « Bishop or Ecclesiastical Superior » to act¹⁰⁰.

Envoi

Carroll's concept of a national church included other projects. He was delighted at publication in 1785 at Philadelphia of a translation of a bible history done by English Jesuit Joseph Reeve¹⁰¹. He actively encouraged publisher Matthew Carey to bring out his edition of « the Doway Bible, agreeably to the last corrections made in it by the late Bishop Challoner », and he acted as an unpaid salesman for Carey, dunning both clergy and laity for subscriptions¹⁰². He remained active to the end, and his last years were as troubled as any had been. Only a year before his death he shared with his fellow citizens in the « state of alarm and danger » when British forces bombarded Fort McHenry at Baltimore and Francis Scott Key penned the words that were to become the American national anthem¹⁰³. Before his death he had the consolation of know-

⁹⁸ Carroll to O'Leary, Baltimore, n.d., estimated by editor as 1787: I, 225.

⁹⁹ Carroll to Plowden, Rock-Creek, June 4, 1787: I, 253-254.

¹⁰⁰ Carroll to Coghlan, Maryland, June 13, 1787: I, 254-255.

¹⁰¹ Carroll to Plowden, Rock-Creek, June 29, 1785: I, 193. Joseph (misidentified by the editor as Thomas, his brother) Reeve's *The History of the Old and New Testament*, a translation from the French, was published in 1785 at Philadelphia by C. Talbot.

¹⁰² *The Holy Bible*, the first American edition of the Douai-Rheims version, from Bishop Challoner's 1763-4 second edition, was originally scheduled to come out in forty-eight weekly numbers. The first was published on December 19, 1789, but then the entire Bible was brought out on December 1, 1790. Carroll's first letter of encouragement to Carey on his project was dated Baltimore, January 30, 1789 (I, 348-9), and they corresponded regularly thereafter. Matthew Carey (1760-1839) was a leading publisher who had briefly edited the *Freeman's Journal* and *Volunteer's Journal* in Ireland, settled in Philadelphia in 1784 and edited the *Pennsylvania Herald*, *Columbian Magazine* and *The American Museum*, the last the most influential news magazine of the day.

¹⁰³ The British attack on Baltimore took place between September 12-14, 1814. Carroll circularized « our Catholic Brethren in this city, during the present state of alarm and danger, often to implore the powerful aid and protection of our heavenly Father over ourselves and fellow-citizens, and those particularly, who must now leave their homes and families for the common defense ». (III, 293). On October 20, he joined in the civic thanksgiving day « for our merciful deliverance from the dreadful evils with which we were threatened by the hostile attack of the British fleet and army » (III, 299).

ing that Pius VII had returned to Rome. In 1809-1810 he had carried on a correspondence with the Archbishop of Dublin in which they discussed the course to be taken should the Pope die a prisoner of Napoleon. Carroll's opinion on the subject reflected once again his general understanding of the episcopal office in the church:

When it is considered that none remain of the College of Cardinals, or, if any, so few that reasonable exceptions may be taken at any choice of the successor to be made by them only, what other remedy remains but for the Prelates of the Church who are yet able to give a free vote, to interfere and provide for the extraordinary exigency?¹⁰⁴

John Carroll was a man of his time. It was his lot to live during a pivotal period in history. His Europe was that of Enlightenment, his America of Revolution. A man of the eighteenth century, he understood that the nineteenth would be home to a different and expanded world. His church was that which antedated in Catholicism the neo-ultramontane movement. In secular politics he was a Federalist, a conservative, an admirer of George Washington. The « furious democracy » of France's revolution appalled him. He liked the « levelling spirit of the times » no more in civil than in church life. But he did not confuse American and French revolutions, and he believed that the Church in the United States should be open to new forms of being and functioning which responded to the new setting in which it found itself. His working-out of this in practice was not always easy nor was it always successful. John Carroll's « learning and abilities » were put fully to the test. On balance he met that test. His like has scarcely been known again in the history of American Catholicism.

¹⁰⁴ Carroll to Troy, March 21, 1810: III, 115.